UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,701	01/29/2004	David K. Kovalic	38-21(53535)B	6459
	7590 12/17/200 COMPANY (A&P)	EXAMINER		
800 N. LINDBI	ERGH BOULEVARD		ZHOU, SHUBO	
MAILZONE EZ ST. LOUIS, MO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/767,701	KOVALIC ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHUBO ZHOU	1631		

	CHOBO ZHOO	1001
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(: Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection filed after a filed after	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>see continuation sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11)		ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	. ,,	mpliant Amondment (PTOL 324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant Amendment (FTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amondment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		r be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered busee continuation sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Shubo (Joe) Zhou/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3(a) and NOTE:

The change from "a fragment" to "the complete complement" of SEQ ID NO:44293 in claims 2, etc. requires further consideration because the amendment substantially changes the scope of the claimed invention. A fragment of SEQ ID NO:44293 can be any partial sequence thereof including one amino acid residue while the complete complement is interpreted as being as long as SEQ ID NO:44293 itself and having a sequence complementary thereto.

Continuation of 11:

With regard to the rejection of claims 2 and 4-9 under 35 USC 101/112, first paragraph, applicant argues that the examiner provides no specific evidence that one of skill in the art would have reason to doubt the utility of SEQ ID NO:44293 as a synaptobrevin-like protein. See page 5 of the response. This is not found persuasive because in the previous Office action, it clearly and specifically set forth the reasons why one skilled in the art would have reason to doubt that the claimed sequence encodes a synaptobrevin like protein. See pages 5-7 of the final rejection mailed 9/4/08.

What is more important, as also set forth in the final rejection, is that even if the sequence indeed encodes a synaptobrevin like protein, it would still require further research to determine how much its activity/function would be like synaptobrevin protein and what specific and substantial utility the protein might have as Raptis et al. disclose multiple functions for different isoforms. See page 6 of the final rejection. Applicant did not dispute the examiner's position.

As for the rejection of claims 2 and 4-9 under 102(b) over Alexandrov et al., the argument relies on the proposed amendment, which is not entered for reasons set forth above.